

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 09/21/2006

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,288	08/23/2001	Gerald A. Pierson	18554F	1186
35979	7590 09/21/2006		EXAMINER	
BRACEWELL & GIULIANI LLP P.O. BOX 61389			VARGOT, MATHIEU D	
HOUSTON, TX 77208-1389			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1732	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				1_/
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		09/938,288	PIERSON ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Mathieu D. Vargot	1732	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	ess
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim rill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this comm D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 July</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		erits is
Dispositi	ion of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 42 and 43 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 42 and 43 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or ion Papers	vn from consideration.		
	The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•		
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the of Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 1	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1	
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)[a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prioric application from the International Bureau see the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Sta	age
Attachment	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413\	
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔲 Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	nte	

Application/Control Number: 09/938,288 Page 2

Art Unit: 1732

1.The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith et al for reasons of record as set forth in the previous action.

2.Applicant's arguments filed June 30, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant continues to make distinctions between the instant "molding" process and that shown in the references, in this case the method of Smith et al. However, Smith et al embosses the thin film which becomes the data layer and this is then laminated to a carrier, which is also made of (presumably molded) plastic. It is respectfully submitted that the operations in Smith et al would be at least broadly readable, and hence encompassing, the instant term "molding" as pertaining to the instant compact disc. No other language is set forth in the claims differentiating the instant process form that of Smith et al and hence applicant's arguments directed thereto are simply not commensurate in scope with the claims. Whatever differences there are between the instant "molding" and the "thin-film system" of Smith et al certainly are not in the claims. For instance, at the bottom of page 7 of the arguments. applicant states that there is no expectation of success for injection molding a nonround disk in Smith et al. However, the term "injection" appears nowhere in the claims. The aspect of making the data portion with arcuate peripheries has already been addressed. While such is not explicitly taught in the applied reference, it is submitted

Art Unit: 1732

that such would have been an obvious feature in the method of Smith et al for reasons already noted.

3.**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mathieu D. Vargot whose telephone number is 571 272-1211. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 9 to 6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson, can be reached on 571 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Application/Control Number: 09/938,288

Art Unit: 1732

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Vargot September 16, 2006 Mathieu D. Vargot Primary Examiner Art Unit 1732 Page 4

9/16/06